

## Chapter 6

### UNITeS

#### EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The RFP defined the evaluation factors as Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost and provided the order of importance as follows. Of the three factors, Mission Suitability is the most important. Alone, Past Performance and Cost are each of somewhat less importance than Mission Suitability, and, as related to each other, are approximately of equal importance.

Of these evaluation factors, the RFP provided that only Mission Suitability would be point scored in the evaluation process. In this regard, the RFP stated Mission Suitability consisted of the following subfactors and assigned points to each as indicated.

Management/Operating Plan	325
Technical Approach	325
Staffing	250
Environmental, Safety and Health	50
SDB Participation	<u>50</u>
Total points	1000

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, the WPET developed detailed evaluation criteria and the numerical scoring system for Mission Suitability as delineated above. In explaining the detailed evaluation procedures, the RFP described the evaluation factors and subfactors, provided the Mission Suitability numerical scoring scheme and specified the criteria to be used in the evaluation.

The RFP provided for the evaluation, but not numerical scoring, of the Past Performance and Cost factors. To assist in evaluating the Past Performance factor, the RFP provided the adjectival ratings of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair," "Poor," or "Neutral" depending upon the assessment of each proposal in this area. Evaluation of proposals under this factor took into consideration the offerors' performance in regard to technical, schedule, and cost on contracts involving programs of a similar nature and magnitude. Regarding the Cost factor, the RFP stated that the adequacy and realism of the cost proposal and the probable cost to be incurred would be evaluated. The RFP also provided that an adjustment to the Mission Suitability score would be made based on the percentage difference between proposed and probable costs.

## EVALUATION PROCESS

NASA issued the RFP on April 9, 2003, and received four timely proposals by May 27, 2003. The offerors consisted of teams led by the following:

Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC)  
Falls Church, VA

Lockheed Martin Services, Inc.  
Cherry Hill, NJ

Northrop Grumman  
Falls Church, VA

Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC)  
San Diego, CA

The Headquarters SEB appointed for this procurement used the expertise at the Centers and relied upon the Center WPET evaluation of the stand-alone proposals submitted for the UNITEs work package.

The WPET applied the established numerical weights and produced a Mission Suitability score within the adjectival rating developed for each proposal. To arrive at the adjectival rating for Past Performance, the WPET relied on the performance data provided in each proposal and information obtained for the relevant contracts identified in the proposals. Finally, the WPET assessed the most probable cost of the offerors with a risk assessment of the cost proposed by each offeror. On September 24, 2003, the WPET, with the concurrence of the SEB, presented its initial findings to the SSA.

After the initial briefing to the SSA, the competitive range was established consisting of SAIC and CSC since these offerors were found to have submitted the most highly rated proposals for the UNITEs requirement. Discussions began on October 2, 2003, when the WPET sent letters to the offerors in the competitive range regarding the weaknesses and clarifications related to their respective proposals. The WPET conducted oral discussions from October 30, 2003, through November 5, 2003, and the offerors submitted their Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) on November 12, 2003. On December 18, 2003, the WPET presented its findings to the SSA and submitted the final report on the FPRs on December 19, 2003. There was no disagreement between the WPET for UNITEs and the SEB even though the SEB retained the authority to amend any WPET finding.

## MISSION SUITABILITY EVALUATION

Scoring each subfactor in accordance with the weights delineated in the RFP resulted in the following ranking of the proposals:

SAIC

## CSC

The substance of the WPET's evaluation of Mission Suitability for each proposal follows:

## SAIC

SAIC received an overall adjectival rating of "Excellent," earning the higher score in Mission Suitability and receiving higher scores for the following subfactors: Management/Operating Plan, Technical Approach, and Staffing. SAIC and CSC received the same scores for the subfactors Environmental, Safety, and Health and Small-Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Participation.

SAIC's proposal contained several significant strengths in the subfactors for Management/Operating Plan, Technical Approach, and Staffing, as well as having one significant strength in the subfactor of Environmental, Safety, and Health. Under the subfactor Management/Operating Plan, SAIC received significant strengths for its highly effective approach for leveraging the diverse capabilities of its teammates; its comprehensive understanding of the Integrated Financial Management Program (IFMP) requirements that included proposing an excellent management approach for IFMP implementation and production support; and its organizational structure and approach that maximized the effectiveness of service delivery through clear lines of authority to the organizational elements with the strategic placement of key management personnel in the service delivery functional areas. Additional significant strengths under this subfactor included SAIC's efficient, effective and flexible approach to the integration of IT service delivery and the high degree of autonomy and authority SAIC gave to the Program Manager in terms of priority, level of visibility, and status within the corporation.

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, SAIC received significant strengths for its excellent approach to strategic planning that included a detailed description of the techniques, planning, and activities it intended to use; its customer service model that provided an exemplary framework for the delivery of customer services and customer satisfaction; its comprehensive approach to innovation that was well founded and demonstrated corporate commitment; its exemplary systems engineering processes, tools, and procedures to ensure appropriate and proven engineering methodologies are applied across the UNITEs performance work statement; and its comprehensive response to the IFMP application development requirements that would enhance the likelihood of successful delivery of IFMP services.

In addition, SAIC received significant strengths under the Staffing subfactor for its proposed Program Manager, proposed Deputy Program Manager, proposed Customer Relations and Support Services Project Manager, proposed MSFC IT Services Project Manager, proposed manager for the IFMP Competency Center, proposed Agencywide Services Project Manager, proposed Network Services Manager, and the team's depth of corporate experience and commitment of experienced personnel for the IFMP requirements. Finally, SAIC received a significant strength under the Environmental,

Safety, and Health subfactor because of its demonstrated strong commitment to workplace safety which included a pledge to be Voluntary Protection Program Star certified within one year of contract start, and its effective method of implementing and monitoring Safety and Health Plan compliance.

## CSC

CSC received an overall adjectival rating of "Very Good," earning the lower score in Mission Suitability and receiving the lower scores for the following subfactors: Management/Operating Plan, Technical Approach, and Staffing. CSC and SAIC received the same scores for the subfactors Environmental, Safety, and Health and Small-Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Participation.

CSC's proposal contained significant strengths in the subfactors for Management/Operating Plan, Technical Approach, and Environmental, Safety, and Health, and contained several significant strengths for the Staffing subfactor. With regard to the subfactor for Management/Operating Plan, CSC had significant strengths for its excellent approach to fully integrating teammates into the organization structure; the high degree of autonomy and authority CSC gave to the Program Manager in terms of priority, level of visibility, and status within the corporation; and for its proposal to establish both an Advanced Technology Council, chaired by the Chief Technologist, and an Information Systems Engineering Board.

CSC also received significant strengths under the Technical Approach subfactor for its proposed establishment of managed service agreements where the government would be charged a cost per unit of work that met defined performance metrics, and for its proposed use of their UNITEs Lifecycle Methodology (ULCM) which would enable CSC to bring the entire UNITEs requirement, with the exception of IFM, under a single set of service delivery processes.

Under the Staffing subfactor, CSC received significant strengths for its proposed Program Manager, proposed Business Management Office Manager, proposed Chief Strategic Planner, proposed Process Improvement Manager, proposed Deputy Program Manager, proposed Customer Relationship Manager, and proposed Security Service Delivery Manager.

CSC also earned a significant strength under the Environmental, Safety, and Health subfactor for its demonstrated management commitment and employee involvement in workplace safety.

## PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In its evaluation of Past Performance, the WPET gave SAIC an "Excellent" due to the depth of its exceptional performance ratings it received on highly relevant large Government services contracts such as the DISA-I Assure, DISN DSS-G and DGS contracts with Scott Air Force Base. IBM, SAIC' proposed subcontractor, also



demonstrated excellent performance in highly relevant SAP implementation/integration and mainframe/midrange data center services. The WPET gave CSC an "Excellent" based on the performance ratings it received on highly relevant large Government IT service contracts such as the Institutional Services and Support contract with JPL and the PrISMS contract with MSFC.

## **COST EVALUATION**

In comparison with SAIC, CSC had slightly lower proposed and most probable costs. As part of the probable cost calculations for SAIC, the WPET made very minor increases to labor rates to reflect the Job Description/Qualification rates in the applicable wage determinations and the executive compensation of professional employees revealed in the resumes of key personnel. In addition, the WPET adjusted the proposed escalation, adjusted the G&A rates of certain subcontractors to proposed ceilings, and corrected a difference between SAIC's prime proposal subcontract costs and the subcontractors' proposal costs by using the higher proposed amounts. With regard to CSC's most probable cost, the WPET adjusted labor rates to reflect the rates in the applicable wage determinations, and adjusted the G&A rates of certain subcontractors to proposed ceilings, adjusted proposed escalation. These calculations resulted in a minor downward adjustment to SAIC's proposed cost and an even smaller decrease to CSC's proposed costs. The WPET had a high level of confidence regarding the adjustments it made to the proposed costs of both SAIC and CSC.

## **DECISION**

During the presentation, I carefully considered the detailed findings the WPET presented including all of the regular findings noted by the WPET for each offeror. I solicited and considered the views of key senior personnel at NASA Headquarters and Center representatives during the executive session after the presentation on UNITEs. These key senior personnel have responsibility related to this acquisition and understood the application of the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP.

In determining which proposal offered the best value to NASA, I referred to the relative order of importance of the three evaluation factors specified in the RFP.

Of the three factors, Mission Suitability is the most important. Alone, Past Performance and Cost are each of somewhat less importance than Mission Suitability, and, as related to each other, are approximately of equal importance.

With regard to Mission Suitability, the WPET found that SAIC had submitted an "Excellent" proposal that was particularly impressive in the areas of Management/Operating Plan and Technical Approach. Under the subfactor Management/Operating Plan, I observed SAIC proposed a highly effective approach for leveraging the diverse capabilities of teammates into a single highly productive service delivery team by fully integrating team members into the organization and having employees report directly to the appropriate functional manager regardless of company

affiliation. SAIC also proposed the use of a common fee pool for all of its team members. I was aware that SAIC had successfully used this approach in other large contracts to increase efficiencies throughout the management, communication, operations, and technical interfaces required to deliver services and believed this approach would be equally effective for the UNITEs requirements. Additionally, I recognized that SAIC proposed an excellent management approach for IFMP implementation and production support and demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the requirements associated with managing an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) environment. The SAIC proposed approach to IFMP involved flexibility within its organizational structure and excelled with regard to measuring the effectiveness of operational support. I believe this approach would easily accommodate changes in program scope, would permit effective operational procedures and processes, and would allow for the transfer of knowledge and skills developed during the module project implementation to the production phase.

Additionally, I believed SAIC's organizational structure and approach maximized the effectiveness of service delivery through clear lines of authority to organizational elements and through the strategic placement of key personnel in the service delivery functional areas. SAIC's organizational structure provides assurance that key management will be responsive and customer focused. SAIC also demonstrated an efficient, effective, and flexible approach to the integration of IT service delivery, which involved having its Strategic Planning Team, Technology Evaluation Team, and Customer Relationship Management Team work together. With the service delivery organizations, I found SAIC's integrated organization, which involved shared resources, would ensure integrated technology solutions to meet user requirements. Finally, under the Management/Operating Plan subfactor, I noted that SAIC gave its proposed Program Manager a high degree of autonomy and authority with the Program Manager having priority, high visibility, and status within the corporation. I believe the level of autonomy and authority given to the Program Manager will streamline the business decision making process, thereby, providing a more responsive capability for leveraging the full range of SAIC's corporate assets. I was also mindful that SAIC had received numerous other strengths under this subfactor.

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, I recognized that SAIC proposed an excellent approach to strategic planning and provided a detailed description of the techniques, methods, planning, and activities it would employ in performing the broad requirements of the UNITEs contract. SAIC demonstrated this in the various types of planning proposed, its use of techniques such as modeling to evaluate candidate technologies, its "Technology Petting Zoo" proposed for getting "hands on" experience, and web site that would serve as a repository for technology evaluations. I believed SAIC's approach to strategic planning would ensure that opportunities for new technology infusion are proactively addressed with customer involvement, while also ensuring that investment decisions are supported by business case analyses, benchmarks, trade studies, and other studies as required.

SAIC also proposed a customer service model that provides an exemplary framework for delivering services and customer satisfaction involving such things as the concept of "access channels" for customer communications, a "power users" category that recognizes the realities of the customer base, the establishment of Technology Fusion Groups that would create a forum to share information, and integrated customer relationship management. I believe that SAIC's proposed Customer Relationship Model would aggressively pursue customer satisfaction through its multiple avenues by which customers could request services and through its application of customer centric metrics, which will foster customer centric behavior.

Additionally, I considered SAIC's comprehensive approach to innovation, which was well founded and demonstrated corporate commitment, included having a technology council of senior technology consultants, building a technology lab, leveraging the team's corporate technology centers to identify and assess emerging technologies, and having a clear understanding of the rationale and leadership requirements for an innovation program. SAIC also proposed exemplary systems engineering processes, tools, and procedures that involved the proposed use of the Common Approach to Systems Engineering (CATSE), the Systems Engineering Business Process (SEBP), and the Common Approach to Software Development and Maintenance (CASDM). These tools are highly effective means to manage systems engineering and would ensure that appropriate and proven engineering methodologies are applied across UNITEs.

Further, I observed that SAIC had a comprehensive response to the IFMP application development requirements because of its teaming arrangement with IBM. IBM has an excellent record implementing SAP R/3, has extensive SAP business warehouse experience, and has demonstrated a sound Enterprise Application Integration (EAI) implementation approach. As a result, SAIC's approach to IFMP application development will bring proven EAI implementation principles to UNITEs and will enhance the likelihood of successful delivery of IFMP services.

Under the subfactor for Staffing, SAIC received significant strengths for seven of the key personnel it proposed. These individuals were highly qualified personnel with excellent references. Additionally, SAIC received a significant strength for its depth of corporate experience and commitment to transfer 20 employees from IBM with SAP implementation and business warehouse experience to MSFC to staff the IFMP integration services area. In addition, SAIC developed a detailed transition schedule and risk management strategy using NASA's most recently published IFMP schedule to minimize the potential phase-in and knowledge transfer issues.

The last two subfactors under Mission Suitability were Environmental, Safety, and Health, and Small-Disadvantaged Business Participation. For the following reasons, I did not believe these subfactors were meaningful discriminators for purposes of selection since the offerors had similar strengths under these subfactors. Under the Environmental, Safety, and Health subfactor, I believed SAIC's overall Safety and Health Plan demonstrated a strong commitment to workplace safety and would provide an effective method of implementing and monitoring plan compliance. Additionally, SAIC

submitted an acceptable approach for SDB participation that did not contain either weaknesses or significant strengths.

I also considered the strengths in the CSC proposal, which received a "Very Good" Mission Suitability rating. However, I was aware that CSC was not as strong in the Management/Operating Plan or Technical Approach subfactors as SAIC. Under Management/Operating Plan, I recognized CSC had an excellent approach to fully integrating its teammates into the organizational structure by assigning teammates to functional areas of work with award fee incentives. I believe CSC's proposed organizational structure would enhance its overall performance success. I also considered the high level of visibility and status within the organization that CSC gave to its UNITEs Program Manager. Specifically, I noted that the UNITEs Program Manager had full authority for the UNITEs Program with no thresholds requiring coordination at a higher level. I felt that having local autonomy at the contract level would simplify the approval process and would minimize disruption to on-going work as new, surge, and out-of-scope requirements are added.

Additionally, I was aware that CSC proposed to establish an Advanced Technology Council, chaired by the Chief Technologist, that would produce regular 3-month "state-of-the-industry" reports to track new technology development. Moreover, I recognized that CSC proposed to establish an Information Systems Engineering Board to review system requirements and designs for compliance with NASA and MSFC IT standards. I felt that the Advanced Technology Council would provide an effective capability for identifying, planning, and controlling new technology integration and that the Systems Engineering Board would provide an effective means to ensure new systems were integrated to standards and were effectively implemented without duplication of services.

Under Technical Approach, I noted that CSC proposed to have managed service agreements where the government would be charged a cost per unit of work that meets government-defined performance metrics. Moreover, CSC committed to develop these agreements no cost to the Government. CSC also proposed to assume the risk of replacing obsolete and under-performing equipment. I found that CSC's proposed use of managed service agreements would provide costs at a constant rate and could possibly reduce costs 10% to 15% in selected service areas and that its approach to obsolete/under-performing equipment would eliminate the capital outlay for upgrading and replacing legacy equipment. I also recognized CSC's use of UNITEs Lifecycle Methodology (ULCM), the framework of CSC's Service Delivery Excellence Program (SDEP), and a key enabler to deliver integrated services, would enable it to bring the entire UNITEs requirement, except for IFMP, under a single set of service delivery processes. CSC also stated that the ULCM would become a government asset that NASA could retain at no additional cost. I believe CSC's proposed use of the SDEP based on the ULCM would provide a set of standard processes and procedures to execute continuous services improvement on the UNITEs program.

Similar to SAIC, CSC received seven significant strengths under the Staffing subfactor for proposing highly qualified key personnel who had excellent references. However,

CSC did not have any significant strengths that were not associated with the key personnel proposed.

The WPET gave CSC and SAIC identical scores for Environmental, Safety and Health and SDB Participation subfactors. CSC also received a significant strength under the Environmental, Safety, and Health subfactor for its demonstrated management commitment and employee involvement in workplace safety, as evidenced by CSC's placing the Safety Officer in a senior position to reflect the criticality of the leadership role, and by increasing support staff for investigation, education, and preventive programs. Additionally, CSC submitted an acceptable approach for SDB participation that did not contain either weaknesses or significant strengths.

A comparison of each offeror's proposal in Mission Suitability revealed this factor would be a meaningful discriminator. I acknowledged that CSC submitted a "Very Good" proposal with distinguishing significant strengths in the areas of establishing an Advanced Technology Council, establishing managed service agreements, and proposing its Service Delivery Excellence Program using ULCM. However, I also recognized that SAIC had submitted a superior proposal as evidenced by its organizational structure/approach, its flexible integration of IT service, its IFMP implementation and production support, its strategic planning, its customer service model, its approach to innovation, its exemplary engineering processes, tools, and procedures, and its comprehensive response to IFMP application development. Overall, SAIC's proposal had more depth, contained more strengths, was more pro-active and customer oriented and, therefore, deserved receiving a higher adjectival rating for Mission Suitability.

Examining the Cost factor, I noted that CSC's most probable cost was approximately 0.6% lower than SAIC's most probable cost and CSC's proposed cost was approximately 1.2% lower than SAIC's proposed cost. The relatively minor adjustments the WPET made for probable cost were due to escalation; no adjustments were made changing either offerors' proposed Full Time Equivalent staffing figures. The adjustments for most probable cost resulted in minor reductions to both offerors' proposed costs with the downward adjustment to SAIC's proposed cost being slightly larger than the downward adjustment to CSC's proposed cost. Consistent with the evaluation criteria, phase-in costs were not included in the base price of the UNITEs although the WPET evaluated these costs to determine whether they were reasonable and realistic and were reported to me. The WPET had a high level of confidence regarding the adjustments it made to the proposed costs of both SAIC and CSC.

SAIC had applied the RFP specified escalation factor of 3.7% on the first day of contract performance for all labor classifications. The WPET eliminated inappropriate escalation regarding starting salary labor rates of exempt employees and eliminated the first nine months of escalation for non-exempt employees, i.e., those personnel covered by a Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBA) or wage determinations. The WPET made these adjustments because personnel typically receive wage increases once a year rather than on the first day of contract performance, particularly when newly hired, and the fact that several new wage determinations and a collective bargaining agreement amendment

had recently been provided. In addition, the WPET adjusted the G&A rates of certain subcontractors to proposed ceilings, and corrected a difference between SAIC's prime proposal subcontract amounts and the subcontractors' proposal amounts by using the higher proposed amount.

CSC included escalation effective July 1, 2004 for all labor classifications in its proposal; however, it used a rate of 1.85% for escalation rather than the RFP specified rate of 3.7% for escalation for six months of the contract. The WPET adjusted the labor rates for the exempt personnel from July 1, 2004 through the end of the contract using the RFP specified escalation rates. The WPET concluded the timing of the escalation for exempt personnel was appropriate since CSC historically increased wages due to escalation on July 1 of each year. Additionally, the WPET eliminated three months worth of escalation for the non-exempt personnel because of the timing of the CBA and new wage determinations. These adjustments for escalation made by the WPET increased CSC's costs of exempt personnel, but decreased the cost of non-exempted personnel. Other changes to proposed cost included adjusting G&A rates of certain subcontractors to proposed ceilings, and making adjustments for uncompensated overtime to reflect subcontractor's total labor rate.

In considering both the proposed and most probable cost established by the WPET, I analyzed the adjustments made to both offeror's proposed costs and the rationale behind them. While I found the WPET's adjustments for probable cost to be reasonable, I also recognized that the adjustments were minor compared to the overall cost of the UNITEs contract and questioned whether these adjustments were sufficient to provide meaningful information for purposes of selection. Though a "High" confidence level was established by the WPET for probable cost, I was aware that the adjustments for escalation introduced certain complications particularly since the two offerors had proposed different phase-in periods.

Consequently, I chose to place greater emphasis on the proposed costs of each offeror in order to negate discrepancies that might have occurred in the most probable cost calculations and because the differences between proposed and most probable costs were negligible in comparison to the overall value of the effort. In doing so, I found that SAIC's proposed cost was approximately 1.2% higher than CSC's proposed cost. I also determined that, if most probable costs were considered, CSC's cost advantage was only 0.6%. I considered both to be within the area of cost uncertainties for a contract the size and duration of UNITEs. Given this, I concluded that while CSC had an advantage in the Cost factor, the difference was so slight that it should not be used as an important discriminator for selection.

Past performance was the third and final factor used to evaluate UNITEs. The WPET rated SAIC as "Excellent" based upon its excellent performance ratings on highly relevant large Government IT contracts such as the DISA-I Assure, the DISN DSS-G, and DGS contracts with Scott Air Force Base and the ISEM contract with NASA Headquarters (HQ). SAIC provided excellent IT security and intrusion detection under the DISA-I Assure contract, provided excellent network management services under the



SAP implementation/integration and mainframe/midrange data center services on the Delta and AK Steel contracts. On both contracts, IBM was able to contain or reduce costs with a very low turnover rate for its personnel. As part of its regular findings, SAIC had one weakness in past performance attributed to one subcontractor not providing timely or accurate cost reports to NASA. Though the weakness remained, during discussions SAIC committed to monitor the timeliness and quality of the financial data provided by all of its subcontractors.

The WPET rated CSC as "Excellent" in past performance based upon its excellent performance on highly relevant large Government IT service contracts such as the ISAS contract with JPL, the ACS contract with Arnold Engineering, and the PrISMS contract with MSFC. JPL gave CSC excellent performance ratings for network management, disaster recovery, and cost management, and Arnold Engineering gave CSC excellent performance ratings for support of the IT infrastructure. More significantly, MSFC gave CSC excellent overall ratings for PrISMS, the requirements for which are included in UNITEs. CSC maintained a low turnover rate on all of these contracts.

The WPET noted several performance weaknesses on the FBI Trilogy contract performed by DynCorp/CSC in the areas of Government oversight and overall performance. Although CSC responded that it had purchased DynCorp in March 2003, further investigation revealed that CSC did not implement new processes and management until the FBI contacted high officials within CSC. Additionally, the WPET found that CSC's past performance in the area of IFMP Integration Support had been inadequate in several areas for an extended period. CSC mitigated this weakness in its response during discussions, stating it had affected changes to the technical and management staff to allow for the successful implementation of Core Financial. Finally, the WPET found that CSC had shown a tendency to overly rely on customer direction to develop solutions on a commercial contract. Upon further investigation, the WPET discovered that the SAP project had fallen behind and that CSC had not taken corrective action until the problems were elevated to higher management officials within CSC. Additionally, the WPET learned that CSC was not proactive regarding the introduction of new technology, which resulted in a "red" rating on innovation. The customer did, however, rate CSC "green" on cost, schedule, and technical.

Based upon the WPET's findings, I agree that, based upon the definitions established in the RFP, SAIC and CSC deserved the same adjectival rating for past performance as both companies performed at an excellent level on highly relevant, complex contracts involving Government IT requirements. CSC's past performance on the PrISMS contract was a major factor in its receiving an "Excellent" in past performance since this contract is a significant part of the UNITEs requirement and CSC is the incumbent. Nevertheless, I believe that SAIC has a slightly better past performance record because of the depth of SAIC's strengths and that of its teammate, IBM. Additionally, I took note that there were occasions when CSC required excessive government oversight and relied too heavily on customer direction. Although I believe SAIC's past performance is somewhat better than that of CSC, I believe the difference is minor and should not be used as a meaningful discriminator for selection.

that of CSC, I believe the difference is minor and should not be used as a meaningful discriminator for selection.

The pivotal aspect of my deliberations involved applying the evaluation criteria to the WPET findings. The evaluation criteria provided that "Of the three factors, Mission Suitability is the most important. Alone, Past Performance and Cost are each of somewhat less importance than Mission Suitability, and, as related to each other, are approximately of equal importance." I found that SAIC had a very slight edge in Past Performance and CSC had a very slight cost advantage as indicated in the above discussion. Given the fact that the evaluation criteria provided that the factors are approximately equal, I determined that SAIC's advantage in Past Performance offset CSC's advantage in Cost. This finding meant that the selection would be made on the basis of the Mission Suitability factor, which is the most important of the three selection factors.

As explained above, SAIC had the better proposal with its management structure, its emphasis on strategic planning, its emphasis on innovation, its emphasis on customer service, and engineering processes, tools and procedures and were strengths that would apply to the broad range of requirements under UNITEs. In addition SAIC had the better approach to IFMP implementation and production support as well as having a comprehensive understanding of the IFMP requirements. Although I acknowledge that CSC submitted a Very Good proposal, SAIC's proposal had more depth, contained more significant strengths, was more pro-active, and more customer oriented. Moreover, I believed the pro-active elements in SAIC's proposal, evidenced through its strengths in strategic planning and innovation alone, would offset the differences seen with the Cost factor.

Based on the foregoing, I concluded that SAIC offered the greater advantage in Mission Suitability and, with its small edge in past performance, outweighed the slight cost advantage of CSC. This decision is consistent with the relative order of importance in the evaluation criteria, which states the Mission Suitability factor is the most important of the three selection factors. Additionally, I concluded that SAIC represents the best value to the Government since, based on the reasons stated above, I found that the technical benefits contained in SAIC's proposal are worth an additional approximate 1.2% in proposed cost.

Accordingly, I select SAIC for award of the UNITEs contract.

 22 DEC 03  
Bryan O'Connor Date